



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ROMAN AND THE CELT.*

HISTORY is a promise rather than a fulfilment, a fragment rather than a whole. It cannot well be otherwise; for it is simply a few scenes from a mighty drama, whose beginning is hidden in an unfathomable past, and whose end lies in the sublime remoteness of an unrevealed future. Science has successfully vindicated the vast eras of geology. Nobody now dreams that the earth began its existence yesterday. Palæontology can draw on unlimited periods for the gradual evolution of the successive forms of sentient life. But it is otherwise with history. It is expected to crowd its successive phases of civilisation into limited areas of time, easily measurable by the compasses of scholastic chronology. We are still haunted with the groundless idea, that we can mount to the origin of human culture, and trace its various stages of development to our own day. Till very recently, the great body even of the learned, believed in nothing but written history, their own history, based on Semitic traditions and classic authorities. Monumental records were scarcely appreciated, and true archæology had no existence, while philology was still encumbered with the grave misconceptions of a shallow pedantry. Nor have we yet fully emerged from this condition of things. The contracted ideas of the popular theology as embodied in its cosmogony, have yielded to the expansive influences of modern discovery, but its equally contracted and erroneous tuitions in reference to anthropology are still tyrannically prevalent. And this despotism of the theological school of thinkers is rather aggravated than softened by their special studies as classical scholars, which unconsciously induce the habit of practically regarding profane history as limited to the annals of the Greeks and Romans, or, at farthest, the nations known to us through their writers. To attempt to mount higher than Herodotus would once have been regarded as scarcely less impious than to doubt the credibility of Moses. "The Father of History" had set effectual limits to idle curiosity, and for anything beyond him, troublesome inquirers were gravely referred to the earlier pages of their Bible. Our studies in Sanscrit literature, and the comparatively recent discoveries in Egyptian Hieroglyphics and the cuneiform inscriptions, have slightly modified these comfortable assurances. Slowly and with much recalcitration, the educated public are beginning to understand that there is a learning outside the area of traditional European cul-

* *History of Julius Cæsar*. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. Vols. I and II.

ture, and that there is a history not yet written in orthodox books. And, of course, as an inevitable consequence, it is also beginning to be confessed that the old plumb-lines are somewhat deficient for fathoming the depths of primeval history.

We have been led into these reflections by a perusal of what is apparently to be the grandest biography of modern times, the life of the ancient by the modern Cæsar, or at least "My Nephew." The two volumes in which the imperial penman has thus far given us the digest, not simply of his learning, but also of his experience in matters gubernatorial, are now before us, and we can judge in some measure, both of his qualifications and the character of the work which he has produced. Its primal recommendation consists in the fact that it bears, on nearly every page, the internal evidence of not being written by a mere closet scholar, but by a man well versed in the practice of statesmanship, and accustomed to weigh empires in the balance. Perhaps it is not too much to say that there are sentences in it which only a monarch familiar with the exercise of authority, at home in the use of supreme power, could have written. Whatever small assistance in the getting up of subsidiary portions may have been rendered to the august author by his court scribes, there is no question that both in the conception and execution of this extraordinary work, we trace a head that has framed decrees and a hand that has signed treaties. This is, perhaps, the highest praise we can bestow, and implies that we regard this life of one emperor by another as something almost unique in literature, for although monarchs have ere this occasionally condescended to authorship, they have not always written so royally as might have been, perhaps, expected, considering their opportunities and experiences. It is not, however, of the literary attainments or the statesmanly abilities whereof this work is the evidence, that we here purpose to speak. That will doubtless be done far more effectually by our contemporaries. It will be quite sufficient if we contemplate the production of the imperial mind from our own standpoint, that is in its relationship to some of the great race questions, with which it is the business of this journal to render its readers more or less familiar.

It is, no doubt, very proper for the general reader to regard history as simply a narrative of the rise and fall of nations and empires, but to the anthropologist it is also an exposition, although a very imperfect one, of the tidal movement of races. To him the eastern conquests of Alexander and the Greeks, and the western conquests of Cæsar and the Romans, are evidences, not simply of the martial prowess and political power, but also of the racial supremacy and colonial expansion of the classic peoples at the period of their culmina-

tion. Ere they could have achieved so much, he knows that the Semites and Aryans of Asia must have sunk into a state of collapse, after their imperial splendour as Assyrians and Persians. And although he has but little history and imperfect monuments to guide him, he has no hesitation in concluding that a somewhat similar fate must have overtaken the Celts of Europe, ere the stern lords of the eternal city succeeded in planting their eagles on the Seine and the Thames. Now, however necessary it may be to base history on these larger views, it is, perhaps, scarcely fair to expect them in a biography, however strictly historical may be the character with whose career it endeavours to render us familiar. And let our subsequent remarks, therefore, on the life of Julius Cæsar be regarded rather as supplementary to, than critical of, the literary labour of the imperial penman of the Tuileries.

It is doubtful if we have even yet correctly defined the place of the classic peoples, either in history or anthropology. Till very recently, we do not seem to have known how much must have gone before them ere they could have existed. Deriving our knowledge of them from their own imperfect annals, we understood but little that was geographically beyond or chronologically before them. Philology has now revealed their lingual relationship to the great Aryan family, while a study of the principal schools of Hindoo philosophy, shows us that this relationship is not simply one of words, but also of thoughts. Nor has archæology failed to contribute to this enlargement of our ideas. We now know not only that there were "brave men before Agamemnon," but that there was a prehistoric cyclopean civilisation in Greece, Italy, and Asia Minor, whereof Tiryns and Mycenæ are the evidence, though they cannot render us back its minuter annals. We have discovered enough, however, to see that classic civilisation rested on the ruins of a preceding culture, whose antiquity antedates, not only the age of inscriptions, but in its rude beginning, even that of the hewn stone.

Was the classic man autochthonous, or was he induced colonially or otherwise, on a ruder aboriginal type? We suspect that this is but part of a larger question, the origin and age of the Caucasian race. Ever accumulating data seem to indicate with continually increasing force, that in accordance with the general evidence of palæontology, the ruder and lower preceded the finer and higher types; and that the Caucasian is not only the noblest, but the latest variety of man. It is still, however, an open question whether the Semitic or the Aryan division be the older of the two. Without attempting here to settle this still disputable point, we would suggest for the future consideration of anthropologists, the possibility that they may be derived

from different sources, the former from the Negroid and dolichocephalic type of the south, and the latter from the Turanian and brachycephalic types of the north. The fact of most interest to us in this connection is, that the Classic peoples were at the line of junction and interaction between these two great races. The Asiatic, that is Ionian Greek, came into direct contact with the Semitic Jew and Phœnician. Of this we have the present effect in Christianity, that magnificent bequest of the Oriental conquests and colonisation of the Classic peoples during the historical period. But is it to be supposed that the action and reaction of Semitic faith and Aryan intellects, commenced at this comparatively late period in human affairs? Have we not, on the contrary, reason to believe, even from tradition, in a corresponding and prehistoric cycle of events, whereof the myth of Cadmus, and perhaps of Jason, are faint echoes, and of which the de-thronement of Saturn was a remote consequence. Inherently and essentially, however, the classic man was obviously of Aryan lineage, and we may add, judging both by his physical type and mental constitution, of nearly pure blood. In other words, he was largely devoid of that Turanian taint which so perceptibly attaches to most of the mingled populations of modern Europe.

But while it is quite proper to regard the classic peoples as one, when contemplated from without, they are, as we all know, historically, and we may add racially, separable into two well-marked divisions, the Greeks and Romans. And while from geographical position it was inevitable that the former should come into more immediate contact with the Semites and Persian Aryans, it was equally inevitable that the latter should interact with the Celts and Teutons. Both the physical type and mental constitution of the Roman, indicate that he was not so purely classical as the Greek, that is, he was neither so harmonious or intellectual. Primarily, he was neither poet nor artist, but warrior and legislator. It is doubtful if he was of such pure blood as the Greek. His cranial contour indicates a powerful Teutonic admixture, as if Alaric and his Goths were only a second edition of some prehistoric invasion from the north. Morally, he was nobler and grander than the Greek, susceptible to higher motives, of more exalted principles, and above all, of a stronger and more persistent will. Intellectually, he was massive rather than brilliant, and endowed with talent as contradistinguished from genius. He was a born statesman, and conserved by policy what he had acquired by arms. He did not subdue the world in a few brilliant campaigns under one Alexander, but marching steadily to supreme power through centuries of conquest, he held the nations in his giant grasp till both their laws and language became unalterably moulded upon his own, so that to this

day Europe bears indelible traces of the ironhanded empress of the West.

The mission of Rome was the summation of ancient civilisation. After her came the flood of race, religion, and policy. To understand the place of Rome, we must, therefore, know what ancient civilisation had achieved. From what has been already said, the reader will be at no loss to understand that we regard it as altogether underestimated. It was older in date and higher in character than even the learned are yet prepared to believe. Already "Egypt's place in history" is admitted to be more remote than was formerly supposed possible; while Nineveh, Babylon, India, and China are relegated to a position, not simply determined by the accepted chronology of the deluge. But while our ideas are being thus rapidly enlarged in relation to the great oriental empires of antiquity, there is another grave possibility looming into view, that does not meet with such ready acceptance, we allude to the prehistoric civilisation of Europe. There, in addition to archæology, we want the help of anthropology. Of Etrurian culture we have undeniable evidence. Of Cyclopean civilisation there are the truly Titanic remains. But it is still lawful to speak of the Celts as "painted savages," and to treat of the Germans as people who always came out of their rude forests. We have already glanced at this subject in some observations on the Roman and Teuton, and what we now purpose is to make a few remarks on the possible prehistoric civilisation of the Celt.

Anthropologists scarcely need to be reminded that humanity is not a democracy, but a hierarchy, ascending in successive gradations from the lowest Negroid to the highest Caucasian type, from the man of muscle to the man of mind, from the creature of appetite to the being of thought; and the grandest problem yet awaiting solution is the due relegation of each great family to its proper place in the ethnic scale. Of the relative place of the Negro, the Turanian, and the Caucasian, there can be no doubt; the order of these primary divisions may be regarded as settled. But when we come to their minute subdivisions, especially those of the last, opinions differ, a satisfactory indication that our data are insufficient, or that our principles are unsettled. We all admit that the Foulah and the Kaffir are superior to the Negro of the coast of Guinea; nor do we deny that the Turcoman and the Finn stand higher in the ethnic scale than the Samoyede and the Lapp. And perhaps one reason why we see all this so clearly is, that we are on the outside of these races, so that we have no feelings of jealousy to disturb our perceptions and warp our judgment. But it is otherwise with our own more exalted type. Here the rival claims of Semite and Aryan, of Greek,

Roman, Teuton, and Celt, afford a never-ending subject of controversy, in which it is to be feared passion and prejudice have but too often supplied the place of fact and argument.

Let us not, however, be too hard upon the combatants in this intellectual warfare. Much of the confusion which reigns in their contest is inevitable. In the language of Comte, anthropology is only now in the process of emergence from its theological phase, and is certainly very far from having attained to the positive stage of development. Its facts are inadequate, and, as we have said, its principles are unsettled, and, as a necessary result, the conclusions of its professors are regarded as little other than individual opinions, from which, whoso pleases, may differ at his discretion. We do not make these statements to discourage our fellow-labourers. On the contrary, such a state of things, while it may oppress the weak, will only stimulate the strong, by showing them how much yet remains to be accomplished, and consequently what opportunities for usefulness are still presented to their choice. It is this, indeed, which renders the study of anthropology so especially attractive to a vigorously constituted mind. We are called upon to work at the foundations, leaving to after ages the comparatively easy task of adding to the superstructure.

The speculation which regards humanity as the collective or grand man, is not perhaps altogether fanciful or ungrounded. It, at all events, has the recommendation of comprehensiveness, and enables us the more readily to arrange subordinate topics as parts of a large whole. Thus contemplated, then, we may say that the Negroid races represent the vascular, the Turanian the muscular, and the Caucasian the nervous portion of this mundane structure. Were we inclined to enlarge our comparison by taking in a wider, and therefore more diversified range of vitality, we would say that the Negro represents the vegetative, the Turanian the animal, and the Caucasian the more purely human attributes of this collective organism. We shall not perhaps greatly err, if we speak of these three great types as successive stages of advancement from alimentation and reproduction to respiration and cerebration. Fundamentally and primarily, it is a question of more or less nerve, which determines all that is subordinate to it. We have been induced to make this statement, although to some who have read previous communications it may sound like a repetition, because if the principles upon which it is based be sound, they must prove applicable to the minor as well as the major divisions of humanity, and so perhaps may help us to arrive at somewhat more definite conclusions in reference to the former.

We are here advancing upon rather disputable ground. Zoology has managed to arrange its classes, orders, genera, and species in a manner sufficiently convenient for all the purposes of description and reference, and on principles satisfactory to most, if not to all, students of natural history. But it is yet, alas, quite otherwise with anthropology. Here we have not yet determined authoritatively whether there be more than varieties. So that while some anthropologists, like Mr. Luke Burke, regard the *genus homo* as a new kingdom in nature, with of course all its subdivisions, at least in a germinal condition, there are others, jealous of the affirmation even of different species. This diversity of opinion is no doubt, in large part, due to the imperfection of the science, but it may be also in some measure due to the merely incipient and embryonic stage of its subject matter. Man, as the latest advent on the globe, is presumably at the farthest remove from his ulterior possibilities. While indubitably the highest of all organic types, he yet manifests unmistakeable traces of ethnic immaturity; and among other concomitants of this condition of things is, probably, the rather imperfect demarcation of his special diversities. But to whatever cause it may be attributed, let us begin with the rather humiliating confession, that anthropology, both in its classification and terminology, is still in a miserably confused and almost chaotic condition. So much so is this the case, that scarcely any two writers use the word "race" in exactly the same sense, nor indeed does any one author employ it at all times with the same signification. Thus, for example, we speak with equal facility of the Negro and the Caucasian, the Aryan and the Semite, the Teuton and the Celt, as constituting different "races," while, in reality, the two last are but subdivisions of the Aryan, as the latter is but a branch of the great Caucasian stem. We do not make these observations by way of urging a precipitate attempt at classification, which in the present state of our knowledge would be premature, but simply as a means of guarding the reader, as far as possible, against misconception, from the rigid interpretation of terms, necessarily used with a latitude anything but conducive to the precision demanded in the language of a fully matured science.

One of the profoundest observations of Swedenborg, who if he had not been so noted as a mystic, might have been more famous as a philosopher, was that the great is seen in the small, as, conversely, the small may be seen in the great. So, perhaps, in the present case, we may throw some additional light on the minute subdivisions of the principal races by studying the relation of the latter to each other, not despising, indeed, the hints which we may obtain from the still wider fields of comparative anatomy and animal physiology,

more especially as these are enlarged by the data obtainable from the structure and presumable habits of extinct species. It is not, indeed, until we contemplate man by the light derivable from a wider area than his own—that is, until we view him in relation to sentient life as a whole—that we begin to thoroughly understand him, or estimate aright his true position as the crowning glory of organic existence; for man is but the realised result of ascension, thus far, in the scale of telluric being. To this, as an effect, has the earth attained in her attempted production of form and function. With the noblest individualities in the highest races, we sum up nature's power *then* and *now*. Thus far has she prevailed—and no farther.

Now, by a comparison of the lower with the higher types, whether we proceed by classes or orders, it will be found that nature has been moving in a definite direction, aiming, if we may so say, at a result, and steadily, or at least persistently, approaching it through successive stages. She has not only been advancing towards specialisation, but also centralisation; the former being indeed not only a necessary concomitant, but, in a certain sense, an effect of the latter. Thus, man is not only the most specialised, but the most centralised being yet developed on the earth, the one on whom the brain has attained to the highest complexity and the greatest power. Indeed, Owen's fourfold division of the mammalia into Archencephala, Gyrencephala, Lissancephala, and Lycencephala, or, to give examples, into man, lion, hare, or kangaroo, proceeds on a recognition of the same principle. So, again, if, enlarging our view, we take in the entire range of the vertebrata, we shall find a regularly ascending series, not only a specialisation, but in centralisation, from fishes to reptiles, and from the latter, through birds, up to mammals. Nay, if we embrace the entire animal kingdom, from the radiata, up through the mollusca and articulata, to the vertebrata, we shall find the same tendency manifesting itself. But to return to the last, with which we are more immediately concerned, it will be found that this tendency to centralisation in the structure and functions of the nervous system, eventuating, or rather consisting in increased cerebation, is accompanied also by a corresponding, and probably proportionate change in the relative form and importance of other functions. Thus, as the brain increases in power, the thoracic tend to predominate over the abdominal viscera, so that cerebation and respiration become of more, and nutrition and reproduction of less, importance in the animal economy. Fishes are the most prolific and the most voracious of all the vertebrates, while their cerebation and respiration are at the minimum.

Descending, however, from these perhaps rather vague generalisa-

tions, let us apply some of the principles involved in them to the matter more immediately in hand, in illustration of the order and relative position of races. And here we are at once made painfully conscious of an admitted deficiency in anthropological science; we allude to its comparative anatomy. We do know something of the structure of various species of animals, but what do we know of the visceral and other peculiarities of the various types of men? With the exception of the facts recently furnished to us by Dr. Pruner-Bey in reference to the Negro, and some others by Baron Larrey, as to the Arab, we may say almost nothing. From the former we learn, as might be expected, that the liver of the Negro is much larger in proportion to his lungs than that of the Caucasian, which is only saying in other words that he is more *foetal* than the higher type, as his cranial, facial, and entire osseous structure would clearly indicate. From the latter we learn that the Arab is the very antithesis of all this, and in the disposition of his viscera, and the elasticity and play of his muscles, is superior even to the European. But for the remaining races and varieties we are thrown back, for the most part, upon external configuration and those indications of function which we find in the established and traditional habits of different peoples.

But before attempting to proceed with such an application, it is well to guard ourselves against a possible source of error in the examination of data. We allude to the necessity which obviously exists for the periodic baptism of the nervous races by their muscular correlates, devoid of which they sink into ethnic effeteness from overaction and its consequent exhaustion. This was the condition of the classic and Celtic races at the period of the Gothic conquest, which no doubt took place in strict obedience to law, as the appointed means for their renewal. Now, it is from their ignorance of this law that most writers regard the Celtic-speaking peoples of these islands as the only true Celts remaining among us, whereas they are simply the imperfectly baptised remnant of the old or effete type of the race. Thus it is not the wiry little Connaughtman who is the truest representative of the Irish Celt, but the well baptised Irishman of the Pale or of Ulster. In fact, the radical defect of Ireland, the ethnic source of the manifold evils under which she labours, is the still imperfect baptism of the Celtic by a superincumbent Teutonic population. She wants racial renewal. So the best representative of the British Celt is not the little Cardiganshire peasant, with his Amazonian wife—the feminine element always tends to preponderate at the decline of a race,—but the normal Englishman, the well-amalgated result of Roman, Saxon, Scandinavian, and Norman infusion. He is the re-

habilitated Celt—in the process of resurrection. So the best type of the Gaul is not the native of Brittany, but the Frenchman of Paris—not the diminutive citizen of the South, but the vigorous and comparatively stalwart man of the North, with plenty of German blood in his veins. We must not confound purity of race with exhaustion. The German is all the better for an occasional Slavonic admixture, and the Spaniard is periodically recuperated, not merely by a Gothic immigration from the North, but a Moorish conquest from the South, the former being needed by the Celtic, and the latter by the Iberian element in the Peninsula.

From what has been said, the reader will be at no loss to understand that we regard the Celtic race (when effectually baptised and regenerated) as inherently and essentially superior to the Teutonic, as the latter is higher than the Slavonic; and, we may add, as the last is superior to the Tartar and the Tartar to the Mongol. From the east of Asia to the west of Europe, throughout the northern temperate latitudes, it is a continual ascent in the scale of being, a march from the partially animal to the truly human plane of existence. In the lower stages, from Mongolia to Teutonia, this will no doubt be readily admitted. But a fair and unprejudiced application of the principles, which induce us to regard the Teuton as the highest of all the muscular races, as, in truth, the Caucasian representative of muscular man, must, of necessity, land us in the conclusion that the Celt is unquestionably his racial superior—in fact, his nervous correlate. He has a higher nervous development, and, as a consequence, more intense cerebral action, with respiration more preponderant over alimentation; and, as an accompaniment of this, he has a more delicately organised physique, and a mental susceptibility, immeasurably more acute. When effete, he becomes diminutive in stature, and excitable rather than energetic in mind. He wants weight and volume of being; but when these have been duly supplied, as they have been in the case of the English and the greater part of the Scotch, you have Teutonic power put into action by Celtic force, and in favourable individualities, like Shakespeare, Milton, and Byron, may combine the refinement, susceptibility, intensity, and taste of the latter, with the breadth, grandeur, and masculine vigour of the former. Were this the place, it would not indeed be difficult to psychologically dissect the mental constitution of our men of genius, and point out the special racial source of their respective qualities. Suffice it here, that Shakespeare is the highest example extant of the perfectly matured, and therefore harmonised, blending of Celt and Teuton; in other words, he is thoroughly baptised, and so completely rehabilitated Celt. Let it suffice, however, for the present, that we

simply affirm the superior quality of the Celtic race ; the question of relative power we will leave for decision at a later stage of the inquiry.

We have hitherto spoken only of the baptism of the superior by the inferior races for the purpose of physical invigoration—the great ethnic event of the last two thousand years. But action and reaction are always equal, even between Iran and Turan. If the nervous races require an occasional accession of bone and muscle, the muscular races, conversely, demand a periodic innervation—an infusion of fire—to save them from sinking under their constitutional phlegm and inertia. Conquest and colonisation are not always Turanian and Teutonic. They are sometimes Classic, as was evidenced under both the Greeks and Romans, and sometimes Celtic, as we see under the French and British, but more especially the latter, to say nothing of similar movements farther east under the Saracen, in comparatively modern and the Assyrian in more ancient times. Nay, in the memory of living men, did not the Corsican lead his victorious Gauls, not only into Germany, but through it, into the very heart of far Sarmatia? And are we to suppose that this was an exceptional fact in history ; that it and the like of it never occurred before? Such a conclusion would indeed show us to be but superficial students of the past, and utterly incompetent to the interpretation of its remoter chronicles. We may be quite certain that in this last age of the world, and on the well-worn track from Britain to India, we see nothing but repeating cycles, ever enlarging in their area and deepening in their effects, on the law of the epicycle, but still repeating. Of course written history makes but the faintest allusion to these earlier cycles, for the simple reason that they were transacted ere it was composed. But geographical names and ethnic facts, to say nothing of mythology and tradition, combine to indicate the prehistoric presence of Celtic peoples in much of Germany if not Scandinavia, in that remote era, when western Europe, from Denmark to Spain, was, if not wholly, at least predominantly, Celtic. The truth is, that as the Celt without the Teuton becomes wiredrawn and exhausted, so the Teuton without the Celt becomes lymphatic and inert, degenerating like an uncultured plant, to the wild Turanian type, which probably constitutes his remote ethnic root ; so, in a similar manner, the Slavon is sometimes conquered by the Tartar, and occasionally, as at present under Russia, subdued and rules him in return.

In an inquiry like the present, where so much new ground has to be trodden, and so many disputed questions have to be approximately settled, it will be well to avail ourselves of all possible aid in their attempted solution. As an additional means, then, of enabling

us to decide on the relative grade of the superior nervous races, let us look at the rank of their inferior and muscular correlates, with which, from geographical position or other causes, they are more nearly associated, and to whose reaction, in periods of ethnic exhaustion, they are more especially subjected. And here we are again reminded of the racial superiority of the Celts. To begin, then, with these. They are placed in the extreme west of Europe, at the farthest possible remove from the Turanians of Eastern Asia. Their proper muscular correlates are the Teutons, and when subjected to conquest from the south, it is by the classic Romans. It is doubtful if even the Slavons ever reached them except by infiltration through the Germans and Scandinavians, while judging by the later and therefore historic career of Attila, Ghengis Khan and Tamerlane, neither Tartar nor Mongol proper, ever prevailed to penetrate so far into the sacred realm of Iran. In Spain and perhaps Southern France they have been exposed to the inroads of Moorish but still Caucasian conquest. Surely a race so especially protected by position from direct contact with either the ruder Turanian or Negroid element, and whose successive racial baptisms have thus always been effected by comparatively pure Caucasian tribes, must, from this circumstance alone, have preserved a purity of blood all but unique. But is not the fact of their being so placed also indicative of a primordial superiority, as if, so to speak, the Celtic area were the highest in the world, from whence, by successive ethnic planes of descent, humanity ultimately arrives at its simply material type.

We are aware that to this very flattering, though rather sweeping conclusion, the scholar will cite his favourite Greeks and Romans, but more especially the former, as an exception; and, historically speaking, he is right in regarding them as having attained to the culminating point, hitherto, of intellectual manifestation. But we should remember that the prehistoric cycle of Celtic culture corresponds chronologically to their Cyclopean age, and that the present epicycle is, we have reason to believe, only at its initial stage, more especially in Britain, the (oceanic) Rome of the future.

But leaving this aspect of the question for the present, let us return to that branch of our subject-matter more immediately under consideration, namely, racial correlation as indicative of ethnic rank. That the Classic is one of the specially intellectual races, and if not the very highest, at least next in order, cannot for a moment be doubted. But let us pursue our inquiry. Italy, within the historic period, has been conquered and colonised by the Teutons, and at least invaded by the Celts, who in some of its subalpine provinces are, if not absolutely indigenous, yet of prehistoric antiquity. And as

mediæval Italy owed her regeneration to an infusion of the Gothic blood of her conquerors, so from their cranial type and mental constitution, we have reason to believe that the Romans were Italians quite recently baptised by transalpine immigration, and thus mounting in the process of resurrection to the very heights of mundane empire. From Dalmatia and Lower Austria a Slavonic element may have occasionally and exceptionally percolated, but as a rule the Celt and Teuton are the appointed baptisers of the effete Italian. The wars with Carthage and some Saracenic inroads indicate, that like all the Mediterranean peoples of Southern Europe, the Italians may at remote intervals have been subjected to more or less of reaction from Northern Africa. Their racial correlates, however, are all Caucasian, and that, too, as in the case of the Celts, of exalted type.

But it is otherwise with the Greeks; they interact with the Slavon, and are subject to the invasion and occupation of the Turcoman. And here a grave question arises, whether we have not greatly undervalued both these races, but more especially the former. In this connection, let us not forget the very important and significant philological fact, that Sanscrit finds its nearest lingual relative, not in Greek or Latin, but in the rude and despised dialect of the uncultured Lithuanian peasant. Neither is it unimportant from the anthropological standpoint, that the Russian church belongs to the Greek communion and was the result of Greek missions, many of its clergy being still of undoubted Hellenic descent. No wonder the Muscovite tends, as by a racial inspiration, to Constantinople; he goes there to be Hellenised as the Goth did to Rome to be Latinised. The baptismal speciality of the Greek, however, as contrasted with European peoples placed farther west, consists in the fact that he is subject to invasion and permanent occupation by a race of decidedly Turanian stock, a fate he shares in conjunction with the Slavon. We suspect however that this is, in a sense, exceptional; that is, it occurs not periodically, by the law of national action and reaction, but only at those long distant and epochal intervals, when as at the collapse of classic civilisation there is a *mundane* movement that precipitates the muscular on the nervous races from India to Britain, and under which the Aryans and Semites of Asia also of necessity succumbed. And as a counterpoise to this, we have reason to believe that the Hellenes have, at other periods, been invigorated, like the Italians and Celts, by a direct Teutonic colonisation. Of this probably we have an ethnic record in the *Iliad*. Achilles is a Scandinavian Jarl; Ajax is a well-fed, ponderous and stupid German Baron; while Agamemnon has many of the moral qualities, at least, of an exalted Gothic king. In Ulysses, on the other hand, in virtue, perhaps, of his insular isolation,

we have the subtlety and cunning of the primæval Greek (Pelasgian?), a remnant of the ancient leaders of the then vanished age of Cyclopean civilisation ; that civilisation, we may remark in passing, we regard as predominantly the effect of a prehistoric *Celtic* conquest of South-Eastern Europe, while, what we know more immediately as classic civilisation, was due to that Teutonic colonisation, of which, as we have said, the racial effects are so vividly portrayed to us in the Homeric poems.

The Greek, however, holds another racial relationship, in virtue of his eastern position, and consequent proximity to the Caucasians of Asia. If, in periods of especial collapse, he is liable to the inroads of the brutal Tartar, he is also exposed to the refining influence of the Aryan, and the exalting power of the Semite. The Ionic school of philosophy in earlier and the Alexandrian in later ages, to say nothing of the system of Pythagoras, afford ample evidence of the susceptibility of Grecian intellect to the influence of Oriental ideas. But the most notable and convincing instance of the profound and peculiar relation which the Hellenic holds to the Oriental mind, is afforded by the history of Christianity, both in its origin and its diffusion. Arising from the interfusion of Greek philosophy and Judaic theology, its first impingement on Europe was through Hellas, while its sacred records were composed and still exist in the Greek tongue. Is it from this eastern source that the Greek obtained his metaphysical subtlety and logical acumen, and that tendency to refined and profound philosophic speculation, whereby he was differenced, not only from the ancient Roman, but also the modern Italian?

From the foregoing survey of the racial correlates of the Classic peoples, it is obvious that they, too, like the Celts, are well protected from a direct Turanian invasion under ordinary circumstances ; but the fact that both the Asiatic and European Greeks have been for centuries subjected to the Turkish yoke, indicates that they are less favourably situated in this respect than the more westerly divisions of the Caucasian race. And here we obtain the glimpse of a great principle, which may perhaps help to guide us in this investigation of an ethnic labyrinth. If we glance at the muscular races from West to East, from the Teuton, through the Slavon and Tartar, to the Mongol proper, we shall find a gradually diminishing refinement of type, a descent by successive stages, from the high-caste Scandinavian on the Atlantic to the flat-faced nomad on the Pacific. But if this be so with the baptisers, do not the orderly and generally harmonic arrangements of nature suggest the probability, if not necessity, of a corresponding condition in their nervous correlates, from whom, in positive ages, they are to receive nerve and intellect, and to whom, in

periods of political decay and organic exhaustion, they are destined to communicate corporeal strength and material vigour? From such data, and by such reasoning, it is obvious that we should arrive at the conclusion that Europe, as a whole, is a higher ethnic area than Asia, and that the west of Europe is higher than the east; and lastly, that the Celtic is the highest, because the best protected and the most nobly related of all the intellectual types, from India to Britain. We would not be understood as pushing this conclusion too far, or estimating it beyond its real worth, as a suggestion for further inquiry, and a hint to future speculation.

But it is time that we should return to the more especial subject-matter of the present paper, from which, however, we trust the foregoing remarks will not be considered a needless digression. And first as to the Roman. He was not a (modern) Italian; that is, he was not a pure ethnic product of the Italic area; he was not of that type, mental or physical, to which the people of the peninsula ever gravitate, after full recovery from a racial baptism. He was too strong and too coarse, too harsh and too angular, too stern and determined, too calm and self-possessed, too osseous and too muscular, for the lineal descendant of a perfectly classic type. Neither was he of this type, crossed by another of yet greater nervous refinement and sensibility, like the Celtic. He errs, if we may so say, on the side of muscularity. His alien progenitors were either Teutons or Moors. We incline to the former, though it is possible there was a dash of the latter. His character and cranial contour present many decidedly Teutonic elements. He was cautious in the formation of plans, but persistent in their execution. Though stern to the verge of cruelty, he was fundamentally just. Till vitiated by the possession of empire, he entertained a profound respect for women; and the Roman matron of the republic was the highest model of domestic virtue and excellence that heathenism has bequeathed to us. He was great as a warrior, he was still greater as a legislator. He was devout, yet not superstitious. He was solid rather than brilliant, and sound rather than subtle in intellect. He lacked suppleness, that especial characteristic of the modern Italian; but he supplemented this deficiency by his iron will. He was neither æsthetic nor literary by natural proclivity, being pre-eminently a soldier and a statesman. His faculty was for the field and the senate, with an occasional condescension to the forum; but his appearance in literature was late, and too obviously the result of Greek culture, to allow us to regard it as in any respect spontaneous. The elder Cato was right as regarded the rhetoricians, but fate was too strong both for him and the republic.

We are quite in the dark about prehistoric Italy. Like Greece, it

was Cyclopean. But what was that? What definite image can we form of the men who piled the massive walls of Norba? What language did they speak, what arts had they mastered, what power did they exercise? Above all, whence did they come, and what bequest did they leave to posterity? To call them Pelasgi, is simply to put a name in place of a fact. We are in nowise helped, but rather hindered, by such a procedure. Of one thing we are certain, they left us the SITE of Classic civilisation. Such a sequence cannot be altogether devoid of significance. The rudeness of their structures indicates that they preceded the Etruscans, as these antedated the Romans. As already hinted, our *conjecture*, and it is nothing more, points to Classic aborigines dominated by Celtic immigrants, in that far-off movement, when primeval civilisation was moving eastwards from its western source in the high ethnic area of Europe, towards the warmer latitudes and softer races of Southern Asia, taking Italy and Greece in its way, as it did at a later, and therefore historic, age, on its return.

But who, or rather what, were the Etruscans? And we reply, judging by the predominant character of their art, a fundamentally Classic people, but, judging by their physical type, with a decidedly alien baptism. Descending from the Rhaetian Alps, crossing the Po, and conquering Tuscany, short, thick-set, broad-shouldered, round-limbed, heavy-built men, with large heads and respectable corporations, implying vigorous cerebration combined with a sound digestion, have we not here the indications of a Czech or Slavonic element? Shall we say, in modern language, a Bohemian and Croatian immigration, the prehistoric foreshadowment of long subsequent Austrian occupation! Was not Count Cavour a modern reproduction of this type, which also reappears to a certain extent, though with a stronger dash of the Greco-Roman element, in the figure of the elder Napoleon? Nay, was not the Roman himself, in part, an ethnic result of this descent from the Rhaetian Alps; that is, had he not Etruscan blood in his veins, as well as Etruscan laws in his political constitution? Was not Latium the border territory of the (Dorian) Greeks of Southern Italy, and was not Rome its frontier fortress on the Tiber? We may depend upon it that Etruscan aggression did not begin with Numa, though it may have ended with Tarquin; and, had we the early annals of Alba Longa, we should probably discover this.

And thus, then, we are brought to the great problem of the Latian aborigines. Dorian Greeks, as we have said, by their language, semi-Etruscans by their laws, and yet, in part at least, Teutons by their mental constitution. Though, of course, beneath all this, as the stock to be grafted on, they were Italians, in the same sense in which

Englishmen are Britons. And we may remark here, that the Romans held the same ethnic relation to the Greeks, which the English do to the French; that is, they were fundamentally of the same Classic type, but with a larger alien and invigorating element, just as the modern Briton is stronger than the Gaul, because he was more effectually baptised at the great Teutonic invasion. But of this more hereafter.

The rise of Rome to imperial supremacy was not an accident. It was due to a mundane movement. Empire and civilisation, in their north-western march, having reached Greece, and eventuated in the conquests of Alexander and the rule of his successors, were now passing into Italy, and settling on the central town and central race of that peninsula. It was simply the second and western phase of Classic development, and, from the mundane stand-point, may be regarded as one with that of Greece. In a sense, Classic and even Mediterranean civilisation culminated in Rome, the wealthy heiress of the total past. The fact, however, that the great political and ecclesiastical mission of Rome tended westward, as that of Greece did eastward, would indicate that her principal racial correlates must lie in the same direction, and so points unmistakably to prehistoric Celtic and Teutonic baptisms, as the ethnic preparation for her after greatness.

We have purposely mentioned the ecclesiastical mission of Rome. As Protestants we may wish to ignore this, but as anthropologists we cannot consent so to falsify history by the sin of omission. Fourteen centuries of sanctity and pontifical supremacy cannot be an exceptional phenomenon. It must be due to the operation of a law and to the presence of forces of a very permanent character. Rome is unquestionably one of the sacred cities of the world. Now the question is, can such sites be *made*. Do they not antedate history, and place even tradition itself at fault. The faith of Islam did not *make* Mecca sacred. It *found* it so. It was not Judaism that sanctified Jerusalem. Melchisedec, King of Salem, received tithes even of so exalted a character as Abraham, and this too obviously in virtue of his pontifical supremacy. It is a most mistaken idea that the union of sacerdotal and regal functions in one person is a comparatively modern invention. On the contrary, it is one of the oldest arrangements with which history renders us conversant. In a sense, Rome has always been ruled by a Pontifex Maximus. Before the Popes it was the Emperors who bore this title. Is not Roma Rama, one of the great Aryan incarnations; and is not Rome still the highplace for the worship of the great Semitic incarnation? To what, then, do our remarks tend? Why to the rather heterodox conclusion that the political Rome of history arose

on the ruins of a prehistoric and sacred Rome, and hence the *cloaca maxima* and other archaeological puzzles, which in reality belong not to the time of the kings, but of their pontiff predecessors in yet remoter ages. Again let it be distinctly understood that we throw this out simply as a suggestion for further consideration.

But to return to the more immediate subject-matter of the present paper. Despite the apparently exceptional, because eastern, direction of Alexander's conquests, civilisation and power were marching steadily north-westward during the entire period of classic supremacy. This was the real direction of the tidal movement, the "set" of the main current to which Macedonian aggression in earlier, and Constantinopolitan effeteness in later, ages were merely counter-eddies. Let us distinctly understand that in her eastern dominions, Rome simply entered upon the inheritance of Grecian conquest, where her supremacy to the last was political, not moral or intellectual, so that she never superseded the language of her predecessor, the Byzantine empire, like its church, being in fact essentially Hellenic not Latin. Hence its slow decline was inevitable, ethnic vitality having for the time deserted the Grecian for a more western area, the appropriate sphere of Latin conquest and colonisation. Hence also the separation between the Papacy and the Patriarchate, and the superiority in power and influence of the former to the latter. Thus, then, we are brought to the second division of our subject, the Celt, as subject and successor to the Roman, or rather to the classic Græco-Roman peoples as a whole.

The idea of conquest and colonisation from the south seems alien to our established habits of thought. To listen to ordinary historians it might be supposed that the Gothic immigration was the only ethnic movement of any importance which had ever taken place. It seems to be forgotten that it was preceded by the extensive colonial operations of Rome, the effect of which is still lingually and perhaps racially distinguishable over large tracts of her transalpine territory, Spain and France being still in a sense, like Italy, the abode of Latin nations, while even Britain is not wholly free from the effects of Roman occupation. Whether conquest and colonisation are to proceed from the north or the south, the east or the west, depends on circumstances. Rome, as the imperial representative of the mundane tendencies of her era, marched westward till her eagles rested on the Atlantic seaboard from the Pillars of Hercules to the South of Scotland, thus completing that great movement which had commenced so long previously on the plain of Shinar. Not that Roman occupation was the first wave which the north received from the south. Both France and Ireland bear distinct traces of an Iberian infusion, but the history

of these earlier invasions is veiled in the night of ages, or, at most, exists simply in the faint echo of tradition.

The speciality of Roman conquest westward is the enduring character of its effects. Over her Asian and African provinces the scimitar of the Moslem has brought desolation and ruin ; the armies of the Faithful, like the breath of the Simoon, leaving only death in their course. Now the western mission of Rome was primarily to the Celt. She compelled him to accept the (moral) baptism of her civilisation, prior to his receiving, in common with herself, the ethnic and material baptism of the Teuton. Political, that is imperial, Rome only knew the latter as her enemy, and finally as her conqueror. It remained for spiritual Rome to make him her convert and her subject, and she could only accomplish this as he made his military pilgrimage to the holy city. The true pupil of the Roman, in the political and municipal, the social and religious sense of the term, was the Celt ; thus, we have some reason to believe, both morally and geographically, by training and position, his heir and successor.

But what was the condition of this pre-eminently nervous and sensitive man of the north-west, when he emerges into light on the page of history ? And we reply, that of ethnic collapse, of racial exhaustion, doubtless after the evocative excitement of a previous era of civilisation. His war chariots, on the one hand, and his Druidical faith, on the other, determine pretty accurately the phase of civilisation, whereof his prehistoric culture was a part. We find it in ancient Egypt, and India, and Persia, and at the siege of Troy. Whether he should be regarded as the master or the pupil, the originator or recipient of this culture may still be an open question, but that he partook of it there can be no doubt. Of course, with this we dismiss "the painted savage" theory to the limbo of all the pedantic vanities, as utterly unworthy either of serious consideration or reply. Chariots and corn fields, and these were retained even to the time of Cæsar, imply agriculture and the mechanical arts of civilised life. They cannot exist alone. They have their necessary accompaniments. They are the harmonious parts of a social state that we may deem barbarous, but which Rhameses would have esteemed civilised. So Druidism was obviously a branch of that primæval theosophy, whereof the Brahmins of India, the Magi of Babylon, and the priests of Egypt were the sacred conservators and expositors. That it was traditional and oral in the manner of its tuition bears witness to its antiquity rather than its imperfection. It obviously belonged to what is sometimes called the monumental as contradistinguished from the literate era of civilisation. This, the *bookish* scholars of the eighteenth century, of course, despised, but we who know how long Sanscrit learning

was thus preserved, can scarcely join in their superficial contempt for the unwritten.

Whether the Celt was the originator or the recipient of primeval culture is part of that larger question, the priority of Europe or of Asia in the march of civilisation. Now, for the free and effective discussion of this debateable point neither the theological nor the scholarly world is yet prepared. Divines, of course, hold fast by Ararat and the Orient! while scholars have still but a very inadequate idea of the importance of archæological and anthropological facts in an inquiry so far transcending the limits of written history. But anthropologists should not be so limited. We know that where written records fail monuments often serve us; while profounder yet than these are the indications of character attaching to the races that erected them. Now it is admitted that written records fail us as to the earlier history of the Celts. The utmost that we can gather from history is that they were once the predominant people of Western Europe. What then do we learn from their monuments? Simply, that for the most part they antedate the age of hewn stone, like the earliest Cyclopean remains of Greece and Italy, of which they may have been the precursors, but could not have been the copies. The monoliths, circles, and cromlechs of Gaul and Britain were obviously erected independently of architectural tuition from more advanced nations. They are in the strictest sense of the term primitive, the result either of priority or isolation. Now with this let us combine the important ethnic fact that the Celts are the most sensitive and refined of all the nervous races endowed, indeed, with sensibilities, to which Greek and Roman, Persian and Assyrian were alike strangers, and which are only now in these later ages finding a voice in literature, to which they are obviously in the process of adding a chapter previously unwritten, the voice of the soul. What then are the historic probabilities, as to this ancient race and this remote past, which are thus dawning upon us? Why that civilisation originated on the true Celtic area in the north-west of Europe, whence it swept over Italy and Greece, emerging into its Cyclopean phase during the process, and so reaching Asia, carried the victorious Aryans through Northern Persia into India. It need scarcely be said that this is exactly the reverse of that movement which constitutes the great feature of history proper, namely, the counter-movement of empire from the south-east to the north-west, now in the process of culmination on the primal seat and amidst the primordial race of civilisation.

Now of all this we, of course, have no hint from the imperial penman. It was, indeed, no business of his in a life of Julius Cæsar to go down to such depths, or stir up such vexed questions. His hero

had simply to carry into effect the racial movement of the Italic portion of the classic race in their aggressive action on the effete Celts, the exact counterpart of the corresponding though previous movement of the Greeks eastward. The two constituting in their totality the political result of classic culmination, whereof we have the moral bequests in Christianity and the Faith of Islam.

What then is the place of classic civilisation in human affairs? What is its true position in mundane history? What is its ethnic value? What is its significance contemplated from the anthropological standpoint? These, it must be confessed, are rather searching queries, more easily put than answered. It was not a part of the primal or south-eastern movement, that eventuated, as already observed, in Cyclopean civilisation. But it was a very important part of the return wave to the north-west. It was pre-eminently the Mediterranean, as its successor on the Celtic area will obviously be the Atlantic or oceanic phase of empire and civilisation, with a larger area and a grander destiny. Through Greece it received influences from the east; through Rome it transmitted them to the west. Classic civilisation was, however, essentially an Aryan product, as that of Phœnicia and Carthage was Semitic. The true imperial era of the latter terminated with the fall of Babylon, Carthage being but a prolonged and dying echo, without any of the true elements of a new life, the *lower* empire of the Semites, as the Byzantine was of the classic peoples. Hence the ultimate triumph of Rome was certain as the result of an ethnic law, she being the existing representative of Aryan power, then and still in the ascendant. This interaction of the Aryan and Semitic races, which reappeared at the Crusades, constitutes a most momentous chapter in the history of man; and, doubtless, has prospective as well as retrospective bearings.

The speciality of the classic man was his predominant intellectuality. In this he was an apt representative of the European as contradistinguished from the Asiatic type of humanity. Under Greek and Roman institutions, the citizen, for the first time in history, emerged into individuality and liberty. The Semitic monarchies of Egypt and Assyria were simply oriental despotisms of the primeval and theocratic order, that regarded the people as blind instruments, the passive subject-matter of their sacerdotal and political rulers. While the eastern Aryans of India and Persia, though exhibiting many features characteristic of the intellectual family of mankind, were nevertheless so far affected by their geographical environment as Asiatics, that their liberty never advanced from the sphere of speculation to that of action. They might be philosophers, but they were never citizens—except of “the republic of letters!” In a certain sense, then, it may be

said that the classic man affords us the first historic manifestation of the Aryan in a position of imperial supremacy. In him intellect for the first time emerged into formal power as the ruling influence of the world. But this is only saying that he was the first European on the page of history, the precursor and preparer of modern civilisation.

Neither the Greek nor the Roman alone suffices for a complete ideal of the classic man. The former was not adequately gubernatorial, nor the latter sufficiently intellectual for the efficient discharge of their combined mission. The Hellenes could never have built up an enduring empire, and centralised the resources of ancient civilisation for five centuries ; while the Latins were equally incapable of originating those unequalled models of literary and artistic excellence which the Greeks have bequeathed to an admiring posterity. Yet the latter were undoubtedly the more classic of the two. But their very speciality in literature, art, and philosophy disqualified them for the ruder but sterner task of government. For this, as already observed, the Roman was fitted by some process of racial amalgamation which had given him strength at the expense of refinement, and provided him with vigour while depriving him of taste.

And now then, for it is time that we should conclude this lengthened paper, though we have by no means exhausted the subject, what are the qualifications and what the legitimate expectancies of the Celt, in reference to the next great manifestation of imperial supremacy ? And this involves the equally important query, what is to be the essential character of impending empire ? In the first place, speaking racially, it will be an Aryan power, and so, among other things, decidedly an empire of intellect. From geographical position on the Atlantic seaboard, it must be largely, if not predominantly, maritime and oceanic, which, in the present age, implies a truly mundane area, more especially in the sphere of commerce and colonisation. It will probably be bipolar like the classic, France taking the part of Greece and Britain that of Rome, the Gauls being more purely Celtic, and so superior in taste and refinement, while the Britons, by their heavier Teutonic baptism, are like the Latins, more qualified for permanently sustaining the weight and responsibility of empire.

In a sense, then, it may be said that Celtic will be the epicycle and complement of classic supremacy. In it the great north-western movement of civilisation will culminate at its geographical terminus, on the high ethnic area of Western Europe. In a profounder and larger sense than that of Rome, it must prove the summation of the past. It will be the fire-baptism of a world whose hierarchies, monarchies and aristocracies, creeds, codes, and philosophies will be simply as fuel to the flame. At what stage of development, then, it may be asked, has

this great epicycle now arrived? And we answer, that of incipient transference from Greece to Rome, from Gaul to Britain. This needs some explanation.

The shadow of empire has hovered over France for a thousand years. Charle-magne, Louis le Grand, and Napoleon I, were its political exponents; while for the last two centuries the leadership of France in manners and fashion has been undisputed. Its language is the medium of diplomacy, and at one time almost promised to become that of literature and science. But there is a geographical boundary to Gallic power. It is European not mundane. It is courtly, social and political. It is an empire of influence and example rather than of policy and arms, of fashion rather than of art. It is not colonial, and in the higher and grander sense of the term, it is not strictly imperial. France can conquer, but she cannot retain her conquests. She has swept over Italy from the Alps to the Tiber, and even to Calabria, but she has never held it in her iron grasp with the tenacity of Austria.

But it is otherwise with Britain. Slow, yet sure, in her ascent to power, which rests not on the brilliant talents but the solid endowments of her people, she largely resembles Rome in the manner of her rise and in the character of her institutions. She has never attempted to subdue the world under one Alexander or one Napoleon. Her empire, while partly the result of conquest, is also very largely the effect of colonial extension, and under either aspect is rather a steadily accumulating heirloom from the ages than the bequest of one splendid and irresistible conqueror. The diffusion of her language, unlike that of France, is not a fashion but a necessity, the necessity of commerce and colonisation. It is already the native tongue of eighty millions of the most civilised peoples in the world, who by universal acknowledgment, march in the vanguard of political liberty and industrial activity, and who apparently only wait for the full advent of a spiritual era to assert a similar supremacy in literature and art. Their numerical increase is, at the very least, one million annually, and the fact that they possess not only the prairies of America but also the plains of Australia and Southern Africa, affords ample assurance that for this increase there will be "ample room and verge enough" for centuries to come. Their prospective destiny is the most splendid that has ever yet dawned on the sons of men, nothing less indeed than the religious, political, social, commercial, and intellectual leadership of the world during the impending age of imperial power in North-western Europe. The geographical centre of this truly mundane empire will, we hold, never permanently leave the old world, whose geographical extent and numerical force will combine to retain it on

the hither side of the Atlantic. Contemplated thus in the light of its ulterior destiny as the Rome of the future, the Babylon of the west, the stupendous growth of modern London can be readily understood. It is gradually preparing to become the capital of Christendom, the metropolis of civilisation.

But without dwelling on the specialities of Britain as contradistinguished from those of France, we may say that this Celtic area, as the primal seat and western terminus of mundane culture, cannot fail to present some peculiar characteristics, more especially at the period of its emergence into political and intellectual supremacy. As the primal seat and, in a sense, the source of civilisation, its people are most probably endowed with a richer vein of inventive and creative power than the population of any other ethnic area. In connection with this branch of the inquiry let us remember that, quite independently of their past history and racial characteristics, we have reason to believe, even from their geographical position alone, that the Celts occupy the highest ethnic area in the world.

But in strict accordance with that harmony which is found to pervade every other department of nature, the characteristics and the history of the Celts agree with their geographical position, and all combine to point them out as the most nervous and refined, the most sensitive and receptive, yet at the same time as the most active and energetic, the bravest and the most enterprising of the children of men. Such a people, so endowed and so placed, emerging into their inevitable and predestined supremacy, after the subsidence and rest, the ethnic baptism and reinvigoration of not only their historic but their prehistoric past, cannot fail to assume a power and exercise an influence altogether unexampled in the annals of the race, and such as in quality and degree can never again be attained till, in the grand revolution of the horologe of destiny, their epicycle shall commence, and in the far future of yet unborn millenniums they shall be once more called to the legitimate exercise of their sublime prerogative as the religious, political, and intellectual rulers of mankind, at the greatest and grandest crisis that human affairs can ever know, that is at the summation of their historic past and the birth of their yet unrevealed future.

Throughout these remarks we have been so occupied with "the Roman and the Celt" in the abstract, that we have failed to make any attempt at delineating the illustrious man, to a narrative and laudation of whose career the labours of the imperial author are more especially devoted. This omission was, however, intentional. As a biography, the work is not yet sufficiently advanced for such a purpose. We must wait for its conclusion. Then, with the final statement of fact

and rendering of opinion fully before us, we may, perhaps, enter into an ethnic portraiture of the character and capabilities of the great Roman patrician, on whom devolved the stupendous task of converting the most powerful republic into the mightiest empire upon record—a revolution whose advent, however, did not depend on any individual, or the fortune of any battle, such a result being about that time due on the mundane horologe of destiny.

THE PLURALITY OF RACES, AND THE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF THE ADAMITE SPECIES.

By GEORGE HARRIS, Esq., F.S.A., BARRISTER-AT-LAW;
President of the Manchester Anthropological Society, and author of
“Civilisation considered as a Science”.

THE object aimed at in the following essay, is simply to inquire how far, and to what extent, the authority of the Bible and of early history confirms or contradicts the supposition that a plurality of races was originally created, or that all mankind were descended from a single pair. After a fair and dispassionate survey of the whole matter, I shall endeavour to draw such conclusions from the entire facts as the case may appear to warrant.

It seems to me extremely desirable, as far as we can, to reconcile the apparently conflicting claims of Scripture and of science; indeed, these differences, if closely examined, will be frequently found, like those among logicians and politicians, to be more apparent than real, more in terms than in things themselves. Although even here I would not for a moment consent to sacrifice truth to secure peace, yet, in this case, I am convinced that the best way to arrive at truth is to banish passion and prejudice, and to discuss the matter in a judicial and philosophical spirit, consistent with the dignity of the subject to be debated. A course very opposite to this, is that which is ordinarily pursued whenever grave and important topics of this class are brought forward; and the prevailing opinion appears to be, that the greater the heat and fury which can be excited, the more surely will truth at last be elicited.

On the directly theological part of the question, I desire to touch as lightly and as briefly as the case will admit of. I may state, however, on the outset, that I am not at all prepared to dispute the authority or the inspiration of the Bible, or to maintain that it is in